

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 31, 2008, has been received and carefully reviewed. The preceding amendments and the following remarks form a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1, 13 and 22 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found, *inter alia*, in paragraph 10 of the original specification. No new matter is added. Claims 1-23 are pending in the application and are submitted for reconsideration.

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,101,266 to Laskowski et al. ("Laskowski"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that claims 1-23 recite subject matter that is not disclosed by Laskowski.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-12 depend, defines a method for checking a document of value. The method includes a step of illuminating the document of value with an intensity (I_B) in at least a partial area. The method further includes a step of capturing, at one or more measuring places, (2) the intensity (I_T) of the light transmitted through the partial area of the document of value (1) and the intensity (I_R) of the light reflected, or remitted, by the partial area of the document of value (1). For each measuring place, the intensities of the transmitted and the reflected light are summed up to obtain a sum intensity value. The sum intensity value for each measuring place is each (i.e., individually) compared to a predetermined standard value.

Claim 13, upon which claims 14-23 depend, defines a checking device for checking documents of value. The device includes an illumination system that is configured to illuminate a document of value at least in a partial area with an intensity

(IB), and a detector system that is configured to capture from one or more measuring places the light transmitted through the document of value and the light reflected, or remitted, by the document of value. The illumination system and the detector system separately capture the intensity (I_T , I_R) of the transmitted light and of the reflected light. An evaluation unit is provided, in which the intensities of the transmitted and reflected light are summed up for each measuring place, so that for each measuring place precisely one sum intensity value is obtained, each obtained sum intensity value is compared to a predetermined standard value.

Laskowski fails to disclose steps of features for summing the intensities of the transmitted and the reflected light to obtain a sum intensity value, and comparing each of the sum intensity values for each measuring place, individually, to a predetermined standard value. Thus, the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

In view of the above, all objections and rejections have been sufficiently addressed. The Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and request that claims 1-23 be allowed and this application passed to issue.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

February 2, 2009

Date

/Brian A. Tollefson/

Attorney for the Applicant

Brian A. Tollefson

Reg. No. 46,338

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK

1425 K Street, N.W.

Suite 800

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 783-6040